ORIGINAL

2 COMMISSIONERS MIKE GLEASON – C

MIKE GLEASON – Chairman WILLIAM A. MUNDELL JEFF HATCH-MILLER KRISTIN K. MAYES GARY PIERCE Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

MAR 1 4 2007

2007 MAR 14:P 4:42

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCUMENT CONTROL

DOCKETED BY

7

1

4

5

6

8

9

10 11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

2526

27

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
ARIZONA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY,
INC., AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR
APPROVALS ASSOCIATED WITH A
PROPOSED TRANSACTION WITH MARICOPA
COUNTY MUNICIPAL WATER
CONSERVATION DISTRICT NUMBER ONE TO
ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SURFACE
WATER TREATMENT FACILITY KNOWN AS
THE WHITE TANKS PROJECT.

DOCKET NO. W-01303A-05-0718

MOTION TO STRIKE AND ALTERNATIVE MOTION FOR EXPEDITED DISCOVERY

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>.

The Maricopa Municipal Water Conservation District No. 1 ("MWD" or "District") respectfully requests that Arizona-American Water Company's Surrebuttal Testimony – filed on March 12, 2007 – be stricken from the record. In the alternative, MWD requests that the discovery deadline be extended with respect to the Surrebuttal Testimony, and that Arizona-American be ordered to provide expedited responses to such discovery, and that MWD be allowed to provide Oral Rejoinder Testimony at the hearing in response to the Surrebuttal Testimony.

II. THE SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY IS IMPROPER.

MWD filed Direct Testimony on January 24, 2007. Arizona-American filed Rebuttal Testimony on February 21, 2007. Arizona-American then filed Surrebuttal Testimony on March

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

12, 2007. Arizona-American's Surrebuttal Testimony does not respond directly to the Rebuttal
Testimony filed by any party. Instead, it merely contains additional attacks and arguments against
MWD's Direct Testimony. Essentially, Arizona-American attempts to rebut MWD's Direct
Testimony twice - with its second rebuttal nineteen days after its February 21, 2007 filing.
Arizona-American should not be allowed this second bite at the apple.

Further, Arizona-American's Surrebuttal Testimony does not contain any information or arguments that could not have been made in its February 21 Rebuttal Testimony. Arizona-American simply provides further responses to MWD's direct testimony. Arizona-American does repeatedly refer to information obtained from data requests from MWD. But Arizona-American's references are to MWD's responses to Arizona-American's First Set of Data Requests – that MWD provided on January 19, 2007. Arizona-American had access to these responses for more than a month (i.e. approximately 33 calendar days) before it filed its Rebuttal Testimony. Arizona-American's behavior - providing Surrebuttal Testimony responding to issues it could have included in rebuttal - should not be endorsed and its Surrebuttal Testimony should be struck from the record.

Arizona-American's Surrebuttal Testimony also denies MWD the opportunity to file responsive testimony. MWD is, at present, foreclosed from pursuing discovery regarding this testimony. Therefore, for all of the reasons described above, Arizona-American's actions unduly prejudices MWD.

Finally, Arizona-American's Surrebuttal Testimony violates the Commission's procedural order issued December 27, 2006. That order directed that Surrebuttal Testimony be filed "on or before noon on March 12, 2007." (Procedural Order at 4:13-14, bold in original). Arizona-American's Surrebuttal Testimony was date stamped at 3:42 pm. This violation is especially troubling due to the content of Arizona-American's Surrebuttal Testimony and its prejudice to MWD.

26

27

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Arizona-American's Surrebuttal Testimony should be stricken from the record and not admitted into evidence. If this request is not granted, then the Commission should adopt the following remedial measures:

- 1. MWD should be allowed to provide extended Oral Rejoinder Testimony from its witnesses on the stand in response to Arizona-American's Surrebuttal Testimony.
- 2. The discovery deadline should be extended with respect to Arizona-American's Surrebuttal Testimony only. Arizona-American should be directed to provide expedited responses to such discovery.
- 3. Because of the short timeframe, Arizona-American should also be directed to make its Surrebuttal witnesses (Mr. Gross and Mr. Broderick) available to MWD for expedited depositions or interviews. Any remarks made, or documents provided, by those witness as a result of this process should be admissible in the hearing in this matter.

400 EAST VAN BUREN STREET - SUITE 800
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004
TELEPHONE NO 602-256-6100
FACSIMILE 602-256-6800
19

4. Although Arizona-American's Surrebuttal Testimony strongly prejudices MWD and places MWD under severe time constraints, under no circumstances should the hearing in this matter be delayed or continued.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 14th day of March 2007.

20 ||

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC

Michael W. Patten

Timothy J. Sabo

One Arizona Center

400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800

Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Attorneys for Maricopa Water District

Original and 13 copies of the foregoing filed this 14th day of March 2007 with:

1

2

27

Ernest G. Johnson, Esq. Director, Utilities Division Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007

By Llebi April